



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,460	06/05/2001	Dan Kikinis	007287.00036	6281
22907 7590 10/14/2011 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051				
EXAMINER				
SALCE, JASON P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2421				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/875,460

Applicant(s)

KIKINIS, DAN

Examiner

JASON SALCE

Art Unit

2421

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-11,14-16 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-11,14-16 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the previous 112 1st Paragraph rejection, the Examiner agrees with Applicant's argues and the rejection has been withdrawn.

In regards to the 103 rejection, Applicant argues that Yoshida lacks any teaching or suggestion of "indicating on the first web phone, based on the displayed electronic programming guide, the at least one button of the first web phone is appropriate for performing an action associated with the electronic programming guide", as recited in the claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner notes that claims do not specify that the indication of the at least one button on the first web phone is an indication of a button on a web phone displayed on the television screen or a button displayed on the remote control screen. The claims only state "indicating on the first web phone, based on the displayed electronic programming guide". Therefore, since the Ellis references teach that an electronic programming guide can be displayed on the remote control device and the television (see **Figures 1, 2a-2b, 30a-30c and Paragraphs 0066-0067, 0070-0074 and 0188-0194 of the '208 Ellis reference**), and Yoshida discloses displaying the remote control device on the television electronic programming guide to indicate the appropriate buttons to use, the Ellis references can be modified to display a graphic of a first remote

control device (**web phone**) on the television that indicate which buttons are appropriate to control the electronic programming guide.

However, as stated in the previous office action, the feature of indicating on the electronic programming guide the appropriate buttons to use, as taught by Yoshida could be integrated into the electronic programming guide displayed on the web phone, as taught by the Ellis references. The Ellis references teach displaying an electronic program guide on the remote control device, wherein the remote control device can be a web-enabled cellular phone. Since the Ellis references teach the functionality to display a detailed electronic programming guide on the remote control device, Ellis is capable of further integrating the help mode of Yoshida to display (**in the remote control device taught by the Ellis references**) the graphic of the remote control device which indicates which buttons are appropriate for controlling the electronic program guide. While Applicant argues that the displayed remote control device of Yoshida is only displayed on the television, the modification proposed in the 103 rejection by the Examiner modifies the remote control display screens, as taught by the Ellis references, to include the remote control graphic display, as taught by Yoshida, on the electronic programming guide displayed on the remote control display screen, as taught by the Ellis references.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 5/5/2011 and 7/7/2011 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements have been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2005/0028208) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,774,926) in further view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,611) in further view of Nobakht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,223).

Referring to claim 1, Ellis receiving, via the Internet, an electronic programming guide at a remote program guide access device (**see Paragraph 0097**).

Ellis also discloses displaying the electronic program guide on the remote program guide access device (**see Paragraphs 0110-0112 and Figure 7**).

Ellis also discloses receiving, at the remote program guide access device, a selection associated with the electronic programming guide (**see Paragraph 0113 for allowing the user to select a television program listing**).

Ellis also discloses transmitting the selection to a display device different from the remote program guide access device (**see Paragraph 0098**).

Ellis is silent as to the EPG selection being entered via a web-enabled cellular phone.

Ellis (**'926 Patent**) discloses a cellular phone 42 with display 100, wherein the display 100 is used to display and select EPG items (**see Column 7, Lines 18-26 and Column 8, Lines 60-67**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the systems of Ellis and Ellis (**'926 Patent**) in order to provide a system capable of utilizing a mobile phone having EPG capability as a remote controller, thereby providing the user with extended functionality and control and allowing the user to reserve programs from remote locations. Also note that Ellis (**'926 Patent**) specifically states that an advantage to the system allows the cell phone to access the schedule information and perform various functions, such as searching for programming of interest, establishing favorite programs, setting reminders and setting parental controls (**see Column 1, Lines 40-46 of the '926 Ellis Patent**).

Ellis and Ellis ('**926 Patent**') are silent as to the EPG including an indication of which web-enabled cellular phone buttons are appropriate for the EPG. While Ellis ('**926 Patent**') teaches the use of a web-enabled cellular phone to make EPG selections, neither Ellis reference teaches indicating to the user which buttons can be used for a particular set of functions.

Yoshida discloses an EPG that displays an image of the remote control the viewer is using (**see Figure 7**). The remote control image on the display further provides an indication to the user each key's functionality when a user presses the key on the remote control (**see Figures 7-9 and Column 6, Line 30 through Column 8, Line 29**).

Further note that the Yoshida reference discloses displaying a help screen that indicates which buttons a remote control device that are appropriate for performing functions for the EPG (**see Figure 8 and Column 6, Lines 30-65 and Table 1 for when the channel up or down key is pressed, indicating that the channel up or down button is used to perform a previous or next channel selection in a channel guide/EPG**).

Therefore Yoshida teaches indicating on a remote control, based on the displayed electronic programming guide, that at least one button of the remote control is appropriate for performing an action associated with the electronic programming guide

At the time the invention was made, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the EPG accessed by a web-enabled cellular phone, as taught by Ellis and Ellis ('**926 Patent**'), using the instructional control keys interface, as taught

by Yoshida, for the purpose of allowing a user to easily know the function of the keys even through he/she loses or misplaces the manual for the device (**see Column 2, Lines 55-57 of Yoshida**).

Ellis, Ellis '926 and Yoshida fail to teach that the remote access remote control/cellular phone is a web phone.

Nobakht discloses that remote control 130-C contains a display screen and can be a web phone (**see Figure 1 and Column 17, Lines 9-14**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cellular phone remote program guide access device, as taught by Ellis, Ellis '926 and Yoshida, using the web phone, as taught by Nobakht, for the purpose of providing an Internet access system that is significantly less expensive than personal computers, and is as easy to use as a television (**see Column 1, Lines 53-55 of Nobakht**).

Referring to claims 2 and 3, Ellis discloses transmitting selections from the remote program access device 24 to a broadcast server and set top box (**Figure 6a for a remote program access device being connected to a set top box 22 through broadcast server 126, therefore any command must be transmitted to a broadcast server and then to the set top box**).

Referring to claims 9-11, see the rejection of claims 1-3, respectively. In regards to claim 9, further note that Ellis discloses that the EPG can also be displayed on the second video display associated with the television (**see Paragraph 0071**).

Referring to claim 28, Yoshida further discloses displaying an indication in the EPG for which buttons are appropriate (**see Figure 8 and Column 6, Lines 30-65 and Table 1 for when the channel up or down key is pressed, indicating that the channel up or down button is used to perform a previous or next channel selection in a channel guide/EPG**).

Referring to claim 30, see the rejection of claim 28.

Claims 6-7 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2005/0028208) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,774,926) in further view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,611) in further view of Nobakht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,223) in further view of Cooper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,904).

Referring to claim 6, Ellis, Ellis (**'926 Patent**), Yoshida and Nobakht disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, where Ellis (**'926 Patent**) teaches the use of a web-enabled cellular phone in place of a remote control to select television programs in an EPG (**see**

above), but are silent as transmitting the selection over the Internet to a second web phone different from the first web phone.

Cooper discloses a plurality of client devices that are capable of selecting television programs to view (**see Figure 5**). Cooper further discloses making EPG selection (**see Figure 7 for using the EPG of Figure 6**) and transmitting the selections over the Internet to multiple client devices (**see Figures 7-11 and Column 2, Lines 45-47 and Column 5, Line 54 through Column 7, Line 59**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the web-enabled cellular phones, as taught by Ellis, Ellis (**'926 Patent**), Yoshida and Nobakht, using the chat enabled client devices, as taught by Yoshida, for the purpose of informing a first network user of activity by other network users, thereby allowing users to know what television programs his/her friends are watching (**see Column 2, Lines 39-41 of Cooper**).

Claim 7 corresponds to claim 6, where Cooper further discloses transmitting the selections over the Internet to multiple client devices to be displayed to all users (**concurrently**) while in a chat room (**see Figures 7-11 and Column 2, Lines 45-47 and Column 5, Line 54 through Column 7, Line 59**).

Referring to claims 14-15, see the rejection of claims 6-7, respectively.

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2005/0028208) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,774,926) in further view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,611) in further view of Nobakht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,223) in further view of Terakado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,441).

Referring to claim 8, Ellis and Ellis ('926 Patent), Yoshida and Nobakht disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, as well as Nobakht teaching that each user uses a web phone, but are silent as to transmitting one or more programs to be separately displayed concurrently with displaying the EPG selections.

Terakado discloses (**in the same field of endeavor**) a similar system which is capable of allowing a user to view a program broadcast on the television while concurrently viewing the EPG data on the remote terminal (**see Column 9, Lines 47-53**). **The Examiner has further cited Grooters (U.S. Patent No. 6,862,741) for further teaching these limitations.**

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the systems of Ellis, Ellis ('926 Patent), Yoshida and Nobakht, using the teachings of Terakado in order to provide a system capable of allowing a user to watch a broadcast program on the television receiver 9, while checking programs to be broadcast from a time onward by using an EPG without obstructing the display of the television receiver 9 (**see Column 9, Lines 50-53 of Terakado**).

Referring to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 8.

Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2005/0028208) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,774,926) in further view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,611) in further view of Nobakht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,223) in further view of Dustin (U.S. Patent No. 6,853,308).

Referring to claim 27, Ellis, Ellis, Yoshida and Nobakht disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, but fail to teach illuminating LEDs corresponding to the appropriate buttons.

Dustin discloses a "Light" Button that illuminates buttons on a remote control **(see Column 4, Lines 6-8)**.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the web-enabled cellular phone, as taught by Ellis, Ellis, Yoshida and Nobakht, using the illuminated buttons, as taught by Dustin, for the purpose of allowing a user to operate the remote control/web-enabled cellular phone in a darkened room **(see Column 4, Lines 7-8 of Dustin)**.

Referring to claim 29, see the rejection of claim 27.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON SALCE whose telephone number is (571)272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Salce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421

Jason Salce
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2421

October 4, 2011